

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are requested.

The abstract and the specification of the invention have been carefully reviewed and revised to make grammatical and idiomatic improvements in order to aid the Examiner in further consideration of the application. No new matter has been added. Also attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the abstract and the specification by the current amendment.

In the Office Action of March 18, 2008, claims 15 and 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Matsumoto et al. (US 7,110,262 - hereinafter Matsumoto); claims 16, 18, 19, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto in view of Oguchi et al. (US 2002/0101722 – hereinafter Oguchi); claims 20, 21, 26, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto in view of Asom et al. (US 7,170,754); and claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto as modified previously in the Office Action, and further in view of Klatt et al. (US 6,097,605). These rejections are now believed moot in view of the cancellation of claims 15-28. Further, these rejections are inapplicable to the new claims for the reasons below, and their withdrawal is respectfully requested.

Claim 29 recites a semiconductor memory device comprising a housing for a plurality of semiconductor memory cards, each semiconductor memory card having first edge portions disposed along the lengths of two parallel edges of the semiconductor memory card, and the first edge portions are thinner than a central portion of the semiconductor memory card. Claim 29 further recites that the housing has a substantially rectangular shape so as to have a smaller axis and a larger axis, and second edge portions disposed along the lengths of two parallel edges of the housing, the second edge portions being thinner than a central portion of the housing, and two of the plurality of semiconductor memory cards are disposed flat and adjacent to each other along the smaller axis of the housing, so that one of the first edge portions of each of the two

semiconductor memory cards lies in a respective one of the second edge portions of the housing. This structure is not disclosed by the prior art of record.

Matsumoto does not disclose this combination of features, and was not relied on for such by the Examiner. Oguchi was cited by the Examiner as disclosing end sections of a housing which are thinner than at an intermediate portion (see page 4, third paragraph, of the Office Action). However, Figures 1-3, cited by the Examiner as support, do *not* show a *housing* for memory cards, but instead show a memory card itself. The housing of Oguchi, depicted in drawing Figures 4-12, does not have edge portions disposed along the lengths of two parallel edges of the housing, the edge portions being thinner than a central portion of the housing, as recited in claim 29. No other prior art of record discloses such a housing, nor was any other prior art cited for such by the Examiner. It follows that since the housing is not disclosed by the prior art, the limitation in which one of the first edge portions of each of the two semiconductor memory cards lies in a respective one of the second edge portions of the housing — as recited in claim 29 — is also not disclosed by the prior art of record.

Therefore, Matsumoto does not anticipate or render obvious the present invention as recited in claim 29, nor does any of the prior art of record. It would not have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify Matsumoto in view of the prior art of record so as to result in, or otherwise render obvious, the present invention. Therefore, claim 29 is clearly allowable over the prior art of record, as are claims 30-40 depending therefrom.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is clearly in condition for allowance. An early notice thereof is earnestly solicited.

If, after reviewing this Amendment, the Examiner feels that there are any issues remaining which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Haruo OHTA et al.

/Aldo A. D'Ottavio/

By 2008.07.18 16:28:15 -04'00'

Aldo A. D'Ottavio

Registration No. 59,559

Agent for Applicants

AAD/WDH/led
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
July 18, 2008